



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ABP-322235-25

<b>Development</b>	17 apartments and associated and ancillary development works.
<b>Location</b>	Britain Place, Dublin 1, to the rear of Cumberland Street North and Parnell Street, Dublin 1
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Dublin City Council North
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	3980/24
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Welbritain Property Ltd.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Harrington Crest Ltd Westbrook Motors Ltd
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None.
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	18/06/2025
<b>Inspector</b>	Alan Di Lucia

## Contents

1.0 Site Location and Description .....	4
2.0 Proposed Development .....	4
3.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	5
3.1. Further Information .....	5
3.2. Decision .....	6
3.3. Planning Authority Reports .....	7
3.4. Prescribed Bodies .....	8
3.5. Third Party Observations .....	8
4.0 Planning History.....	8
5.0 Policy Context.....	8
5.1. Development Plan.....	8
5.2. Urban Development and Building Heights: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2018.....	11
5.5. Natural Heritage Designations .....	14
5.6. EIA Screening .....	14
6.0 The Appeal .....	15
6.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	15
6.2. Applicant Response .....	17
6.3. Planning Authority Response.....	18
6.4. Observations.....	18
6.5. Further Responses .....	18
7.0 Assessment.....	18
8.0 AA Screening.....	30
9.0 Recommendation.....	31

10.0	Reasons and Considerations.....	31
	<b>Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination .....</b>	<b>36</b>
Appendix 1 – Form 1: EIA Pre-Screening		
	Form 2: EIA Preliminary Examination	

## 1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site is located along Britain Place, to the rear of Parnell St and Cumberland Street North. The appeal site is a brownfield / infill site, with a stated area of 270m<sup>2</sup> and is bounded to the north by a 2-storey warehouse type building, to the east by a 2-storey building, occupied by the Dept. of Social Protection and to the west and south by Britain Place Lane.
- 1.2. Access from Parnell Street to Britain Place comprises a 3m wide lane at the junction with Parnell Street, widening to 6.3m at the appeal site. Access from Cumberland Street North comprises a 6m wide lane at the junction with Cumberland Street North widening to 7.2 metres at the appeal site.
- 1.3. Building heights in the vicinity range between 2 to 11 storeys. Building heights range between 2-4 storeys along Parnell Street, 2 to 5 storeys along Cumberland Street North and 4-5 storeys along Cathal Brugha Street. Directly to the south of the site along Britain Place is an apartment complex 3-storeys in height. Directly to the west of the site along Britain Place is an 11-storey aparthotel currently under construction on the old Telephone House site fronting onto Marlborough Street opposite the building occupied by An Bord Pleanála. It should be noted that the appeal site is currently been used as a construction compound for the proposed aparthotel development..

## 2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. The proposed development is for the construction of a 7-Level apartment building, with setbacks at the penthouse level to present a 6-level apartment building to the lane consisting of:
  - 16. No apartments comprising 3 studio units, 3 one-bed units, 6 two-bed units and 4 three-bed units.

*(I note that when the application was submitted to the Planning Authority The proposal consisted of 17. No apartments comprising 4 studio units, 4 one-bed units, 6 two-bed units and 3 three-bed units, however in the applicants response to a further information request by the PA this was reduced to 16 no.*

*apartments with the replacement on level four of a one bed apartment and one studio apartment with a 1 no. three bed apartment.)*

- Ancillary residential functions include a resident's foyer lounge and meeting rooms
- Plant area and bin storage
- Bicycle storage to accommodate 38 no. bicycles located at ground level
- The development entrance is accessed directly from Britain Place, with separate entrances for bicycle and bin stores.
- The total gross internal area of the development is 1,595m<sup>2</sup>.

### **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

#### **3.1. Further Information**

The Planning Authority requested further information regarding the proposed development relating to:

- Communal open space requirements in accordance with the 2023 Apartment Guidelines.
- Ensure adequate housing mix in accordance with development plan standards.
- Address 3<sup>rd</sup> party submissions relating to provision of windows and terraces to the north which give rise to privacy, overlooking and future development potential issues.
- Transport Division issues relating to safe and comfortable movement of vulnerable users' interaction with the site and public domain.
- Transport Division issues regarding bicycle parking provisions.

All information was submitted to the Planning Authority.

- Applicant detailed how it was not possible to provide communal open space in accordance with the guidelines. The Planning Authority can allow flexibility

and consider that the 21m<sup>2</sup> communal terrace on Seventh Floor and residents lounge at ground level are sufficient.

- To ensure compliance with development plan mix of units, applicant reduced total number of apartments to 16 by replacing 1 studio unit and 1 one-bed unit with a 1 three-bed unit. (Level 4 of proposed development)
- North façade of common area on 7<sup>th</sup> level will be solid wall providing no overlooking or loss of privacy. Propose to retain glass but to provide glazing as 'opal laminated' glass which is white in colour to prevent overlooking but allows daylight to enter
- Details provided to address issues raised by Transport Planning Division, including provision of footpath, pedestrian crossing and auto tracking details.
- Revised bicycle storage details have been submitted, increasing the number from 38 to 44 no. spaces

### 3.2. Decision

Following receipt and assessment of the further information received, the Planning Authority issued a notification of decision to grant permission subject to 15 Conditions.

Conditions of Note include:

- Cond. 2 Levy €150,526.95 for public infrastructure and facilities in accordance with development contribution scheme.
- Cond. 3. Levy €34,000.00 in accordance with the LUAS Cross City Scheme
- Cond. 4. Bond/Cash Deposit for satisfactory maintenance, completion or reinstatement works of services/infrastructure in charge of Dublin City Council
- Cond.5. The bronze cladding panels on northern elevations shall be reduced in width and replaced with a complimentary brick or stone finish.
- Cond. 10 Naming of developments
- Cond. 11 Management scheme relating to areas not taken in charge

### **3.3. Planning Authority Reports**

#### **3.3.1. Planning Reports**

The Planner's Report had regard to the following issues.

- The proposed residential use is a permissible use within the Z5 zoning objective of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028.
- Site Coverage and Plot Ratios exceed standards of the development plan. However, exceptions are considered as the site is a brownfield site, in an area in need of urban renewal and is in close proximity to high quality public transport and accessibility.
- Height appropriate to adjoining buildings and unlikely to impact on surrounding properties
- Design is considered appropriate, finishes to be conditioned.
- Visually acceptable within the urban context.
- Daylight and sunlight report indicate some level of overshadowing would be expected, levels not significant.
- Unit Mix and Communal space sufficient following request for further information.
- Access, servicing and parking sufficient following request for further information.
- The Planner's Report did not consider that either Appropriate Assessment or Environmental Impact Assessment was required.

#### **3.3.2. Other Technical Reports**

- Drainage Division: No objection subject to appropriate conditions
- Air Quality Monitoring and Noise Control Unit: No objection subject to appropriate conditions.
- Transport and Planning Division: No objection following the submission of further information and subject to appropriate conditions.

### 3.4. Prescribed Bodies

- TII: Section 49 Luas Line Levy should be applied.

### 3.5. Third Party Observations

Two third party submissions were received. Issues raised include:

- Windows and terraces overlook property to north
- Impact development potential of property to north.
- Issues relating to right to light should adjoining property be developed

## 4.0 Planning History

Appeal Site:

No planning history

Adjoining Sites:

PA Ref: 4962/22 (ABP REF: ABP-315712-23 appeal withdrawn.)

Planning permission granted by Dublin City Council to refurbish and change use of existing Telephone House complex to an aparthotel.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 (DCDP) is the relevant statutory development plan for the area. It has regard to national and regional policies in respect to infill development within the existing built-up areas.
- 5.1.2. The land to which the subject site is located is zoned 'Z5 City Centre' which is *'to consolidate and facilitate development of the central area, and to identify, reinforce, strengthen and protect its civic design character and dignity.'* Residential is a permissible use within this land use zoning.
- 5.1.3. Policy SC 10 ensures *"appropriate densities and the creation of sustainable communities in accordance with the principles set out in Guidelines for Planning*



*Authorities on Sustainable Residential Development in Urban Areas (Cities, Towns and Villages), (Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, 2009), and its companion document, Urban Design Manual: A Best Practice Guide and any amendment thereof.”*

- 5.1.4. Policy SC12 promotes ‘a variety of housing and apartment types and sizes, as well as tenure diversity and mix, which will create both a distinctive sense of place in particular areas and neighbourhoods, including coherent streets and open spaces and provide for communities to thrive.’
- 5.1.5. Policy SC14 ensures “a strategic approach to building height in the city that accords with *The Urban Development and Building Height Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2018) ..*.”
- 5.1.6. The land to which the subject site is located within Strategic Development Regeneration Area (SDRA) 10: North Inner City. Chapter 13 Section 13.12 of the DCDP details the overarching principles for development proposals within SDRA 10
- To promote an increased residential population and the successful integration of new and established residents and communities
  - All new development of significant height and density over the prevailing context must accord with the specific performance criteria as set out in Appendix 3 of DCDP
  - High-quality architectural design and building materials will be encouraged throughout the SDRA. Architectural variety shall be encouraged, and contextual urban grain shall be considered, particularly for infill development. Flexibility will be applied in relation to design style provided there is appropriate regard to the built context and relevant policy.
- 5.1.7. Section 15.5.5 of the DCDP states that
- “Dublin City Council will support higher density development in appropriate urban locations in accordance with the NPF, RSES and the Section 28 Guidelines which seek to consolidate development within existing urban areas. Higher density development allows land to be used more efficiently, assists in regeneration and minimises urban expansion. Higher densities maintain the vitality and viability of local*

*services and provide for the critical mass for successful functionality of public transport facilities.*

*New development should achieve a density that is appropriate to the site conditions and surrounding neighbourhood. The density of a proposal should respect the existing character, context and urban form of an area and seek to protect existing and future amenity. An urban design and quality-led approach to creating urban densities will be promoted, where the focus will be on creating sustainable urban villages and neighbourhoods.*

*All proposals for higher densities must demonstrate how the proposal contributes to place-making and the identity of an area, as well as the provision of community facilities and/or social infrastructure to facilitate the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods. Refer to Appendix 3 for further details.”*

- 5.1.8. Appendix 3 of the DCDP supports densities of 100-250 units per hectare for development located in SDRAs and that there is a general presumption against schemes in excess of 300 units per hectare. Schemes in excess of this density will only be considered in exceptional circumstances where a compelling architectural and urban design rationale has been presented. However, where a scheme proposes buildings and densities that are significantly higher and denser, then the prevailing context, the performance criteria set out in Table 3 of the DCDP should apply.
- 5.1.9. Appendix 3 of the DCDP provides an indicative Plot Ratio of 2.5-3.0 and Indicative Site Coverage of 60-90% in Central areas. Higher plot Ratios and Site Coverage may be permitted in certain circumstances such as:
- Adjoining major public transport corridors, where an appropriate mix of residential and commercial uses is proposed.
  - To facilitate comprehensive re-development in areas in need of urban renewal.
- 5.1.10. Appendix 3 has identified locations that are generally suitable and appropriate for accommodating a more intensive form of development, including increased height, which is in accordance with SPPR1 of the Building height Guidelines. The DCDP identifies the City Centre as a location where a default position of 6 storeys will be promoted subject to site specific characteristics.

## 5.2. Urban Development and Building Heights: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2018

These guidelines set out policy and guidance in relation to Urban Development and Building Height and sets out guidance in relation to development plans and development management.

- 5.2.1. SPPR 1 states that *'In accordance with Government policy to support increased building height and density in locations with good public transport accessibility, particularly town/ city cores, planning authorities shall explicitly identify, through their statutory plans, areas where increased building height will be actively pursued for both redevelopment, regeneration and infill development to secure the objectives of the National Planning Framework and Regional Spatial and Economic Strategies and shall not provide for blanket numerical limitations on building height.'*
- 5.2.2. The Assessment Criteria at the city scale includes the following:
- *The site is well served by public transport with high capacity, frequent service and good links to other modes of public transport.*
  - *Development proposals incorporating increased building height, including proposals within architecturally sensitive areas, should successfully integrate into/ enhance the character and public realm of the area, having regard to topography, its cultural context, setting of key landmarks, protection of key views. Such development proposals shall undertake a landscape and visual assessment, by a suitably qualified practitioner such as a chartered landscape architect.*
  - *On larger urban redevelopment sites, proposed developments should make a positive contribution to place-making, incorporating new streets and public spaces, using massing and height to achieve the required densities but with sufficient variety in scale and form to respond to the scale of adjoining developments and create visual interest in the streetscape.*

### 5.3. Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024

These guidelines set out policy and guidance in relation to planning and development of urban and rural settlements, which focus on sustainable residential development and the creation of compact settlements.

- 5.3.1. Section 3 of the guidelines, details density ranges within settlements by area type. Section 3.3.1 provides for density ranges for Dublin and identifies three area types which are ‘*City-Centre*’, ‘*City-Urban Networks*’ and ‘*City-Suburban/Urban Extension*’.

The ‘*City-Centre*’ comprises the city core and immediately surrounding neighbourhoods, are the most central and accessible urban locations nationally with the greatest intensity of land uses, including higher order employment, recreation, cultural, education, commercial and retail uses. It is a policy and objective of these Guidelines that residential densities in the range 100 dph-300 dph (net) shall generally be applied in the centre of Dublin.

- 5.3.2. Section 3.3.6 outlines exceptions as follows:

(a) There is a presumption in these Guidelines against very high densities that exceed 300 dph (net) on a piecemeal basis. Densities that exceed 300 dph (net) are open for consideration on a plan-led basis only and where the opportunity for densities and building heights that are greater than prevailing densities and building height is identified in a relevant statutory plan.

(b) Strategic and sustainable development locations of scale (described in section 4.4.4 of the Development Plans Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2022) will be capable of defining densities or density ranges across different neighbourhoods on a plan led basis, based on considerations such as proximity to centre, level of public transport service and relationship with surrounding built form. Densities within strategic and sustainable development locations may, therefore, exceed the ranges set out in Section 3.3 on a plan-led basis.

(c) In the case of very small infill sites that are not of sufficient scale to define their own character and density, the need to respond to the scale and form of surrounding development, to protect the amenities of surrounding properties and to protect biodiversity may take precedence over the densities set out in this Chapter.

5.3.3. Section 5 of the guidelines details development management standards that apply to residential developments.

- SPPR 3 requires that in city centres car-parking provision should be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated.
- SPPR 4 relates to cycle parking and storage and states that a general minimum standard of 1 cycle storage space per bedroom should be applied.

**5.4. Planning Design Standards for Apartments: Guidelines for Planning Authorities, 2025**

5.4.1. I note that the Planning Design Standards for Apartments Guidelines for Planning Authorities were published on 08.07.2025. Section 1.1 of this document states that the guidelines only apply to planning applications submitted after the publication of the guidelines. I am therefore satisfied that these guidelines are not relevant to the current appeal.

**5.5. Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2023**

Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023) set out national policy and standards for apartment development including recommended standards in relation to housing mix, aspect, and minimum floor areas.

SPPR1 States that

*Housing developments may include up to 50% one-bedroom or studio type units (with no more than 20-25% of the total proposed development as studios) and there shall be no minimum requirement for apartments with three or more bedrooms. Statutory development plans may specify a mix for apartment and other housing developments, but only further to an evidence-based Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HNDA), that has been agreed on an area, county, city or metropolitan area basis and incorporated into the relevant development plan(s).*

SPPR 2 states that

*For all building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size, or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25ha:*

- *Where up to 9 residential units are proposed, notwithstanding SPPR 1, there shall be no restriction on dwelling mix, provided no more than 50% of the development (i.e. up to 4 units) comprises studio-type units.*
- *Where between 10 to 49 residential units are proposed, the flexible dwelling mix provision for the first 9 units may be carried forward and the parameters set out in SPPR 1, shall apply from the 10th residential unit to the 49th.*

SPPR3 states

*Minimum Apartment Floor Areas:*

- *Studio apartment (1 person) 37m sq.*
- *1-bedroom apartment (2 persons) 45m sq.*
- *2-bedroom apartment (4 persons) 73m sq.*
- *3-bedroom apartment (5 persons) 90m sq.*

5.5.1. Section 3.39 of the guidelines state that *“for building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25 hectares, private amenity space requirements may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality.”*

5.5.2. Section 4.29 states that *“for building refurbishment schemes on sites of any size or urban infill schemes on sites of up to 0.25-hectare car parking provision may be relaxed in part or whole, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality and location.”*

## 5.6. **Natural Heritage Designations**

None Relevant

## 5.7. **EIA Screening**

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The

proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

Westbrook Motors Ireland Limited.

(Pre FI grounds of appeal)

- First to sixth floor, wide windows from Living / Dining / Kitchen Space of units 3, 6, 9, 12, 14, 16 directly facing and overlooking adjoining property to North.
- North facing terrace, first floor unit 3 would have significant impact on any future development opportunity for adjoining property.
- Seventh floor spacious terrace with three wide openings between columns onto property to north, considerable overlooking issue arises.
- Each floor landing has a large full height window opening to a common lobby along the north elevation, direct loss of privacy.

(Post decision grounds of appeal)

- proposed bricking up of the opening in the level 7 rooftop common terrace eliminates the overlooking of our client's property.
- The proposed use of 'opal laminated' glass is not considered an acceptable solution, such windows would require access to natural daylight, any development exceeding the first-floor level of the adjoining property to the north would be impacted and would limit their access to daylight.
- The issues of overlooking have not been adequately addressed by simply replacing the clear glass with 'opal laminated' glass, such windows will require daylight even though applicant states that they are not the primary source of illumination.
- Highlights that established principles, no windows should be permitted along the northern elevation under any circumstances, to ensure the future development of adjoining property is not unreasonably constrained.

- No first-floor plans submitted in response to the FI therefore first floor terrace still has overlooking issues and issues relating to restricting the potential development of the adjoining site.
- In conclusion no windows should be permitted along the northern elevation and the terraces should be omitted, in order to provide privacy and to ensure that the development potential of adjoining properties is not constrained.

Harrington Crest Limited.

- The inclusion of windows and communal open space along the northern elevation of the proposed development restricts the development potential of the adjoining site to the North.
- Notes that the planning authority tried to mitigate the situation by way of a condition, however the conditions do not meet the intended outcome.
- Notes that the requirement for windows along the northern elevation is due to the nature of the proposed development on a site that is too small for the development proposed.
- Only solution is to refuse permission and to ensure that any new development proposal contains blank gable on the northern elevation..
- Outlines that the proposal does not comply with the policies and standards of the DCDP. Notes the site coverage is 97% and the plot ratio is 5.9. Exceeds the permitted standard and notes that any development exceeding plot ratio of 3.0 must be accompanied by a compelling case. Notes no compelling case submitted by the applicants.
- Notes the density of 708 units per hectare exceeds the DCDP density requirements of between 100-250 units per hectare and notes that schemes in excess of 300 units per ha will only be considered in exceptional circumstances where a compelling architectural and urban design rationale has been presented.
- Notes no compelling arguments have been presented to justify the excessive density of the proposed development. Notes that normal practice in an inner-



city site where two sites adjoining, the common boundary should be a blank wall on each site.

- Details the further information requested by the PA and responses submitted, noting that the PA concluded that the mitigation proposed address the concerns raised by third parties with regard to loss of privacy and overlooking. The appellant states that the mitigation proposed and conditions attached do not overcome the very valid objections submitted.
- Outlines development proposal for the adjoining lands stating that the development will have a blank wall along the boundary with the appeal site.
- Emphasis the restrictions that the proposed development would have on the development of the adjoining site, Future occupants of the proposed development would likely object to any development on the adjoining site that reduces the light available to them.
- Notes, best practice approach in urban areas to provide blank facades to adjoining property boundaries, protects development rights, provide efficient land utilisation, design integration and urban coherence.
- The PAs decision to accept mitigation measures fails to recognise that the fundamental issue is not one of privacy or overlooking, but rather the inappropriate relationship between the proposed building and the boundary with the adjoining developable site.

## **6.2. Applicant Response**

- Notes the grounds of appeal in that the windows proposed that face north and are proximate (but set back) from the adjoining property boundary are not acceptable for reasons of loss of privacy, overlooking and inhibiting their own development potential.
- Notes matter raised by appellants to PA during assessment of application
- Adjustments made (use of opal laminated privacy glass) in response to FI and PA found reasonable balance permit the development.

- No intention to reiterate the logic of the response to the FI and they are of the opinion that the response to the further information this was well considered and proposed appropriate design amendments.
- Notes that should the Board not concur the proposed amendments the logical step would be to direct subject window openings be removed and replaced with solid walls, and notes that this would result in a slight reduction in the quality of the apartments.

### **6.3. Planning Authority Response**

Request to uphold their position and that the following conditions be applied.

- Section 48 development contribution
- Section 49 Luas Cross City development contribution
- Payment of bond
- Contribution in lieu of open space requirement not been met
- Naming and numbering condition
- Management company condition.

### **6.4. Observations**

- None

### **6.5. Further Responses**

- None

## **7.0 Assessment**

- 7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the Planning Authority, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Building Height
- Density
- Plot Ratio / Site Coverage
- Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments.2023
- Daylight and Overshadowing
- Potential Impact on Development Potential of adjoining Lands.
- Other Matters

## 7.2. Principle of Development

- 7.2.1. The subject site is located within Dublin City Centre. It is currently considered a vacant brownfield /infill site. The land to which the subject site is located is zoned 'Z5 City Centre' which is *'to consolidate and facilitate development of the central area, and to identify, reinforce, strengthen and protect its civic design character and dignity.'* Residential is a permissible use within this land use zoning.
- 7.2.2. The land to which the subject site is located is in Strategic Development Regeneration Area (SDRA) 10: North Inner City. I consider that the proposed site is an optimal location within the city centre to contribute to the regeneration of this inner-city location.
- 7.2.3. I am satisfied that the principle of residential development is a permitted use within the City Centre zoning and the North Inner City Strategic Development Regeneration Area.

## 7.3. Building Height.

- 7.3.1. The proposed development is a 7-level apartment building consisting of 16 no. apartments. SSPR1 of the of the Urban Development and Building Heights: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2018, requires Planning Authorities to identify locations suitable and appropriate for accommodating developments of increased height. Appendix 3 of the DCDP identifies the City Centre as a location where a default position of 6 storeys will be promoted subject to site specific characteristics.

- 7.3.2. I noted from my site inspection that building heights in the vicinity of the appeal site range between 2-11 storeys in height. Building heights to the north are 2-4 storeys, to the west 2-5 storeys and to the south 3-5 storeys. The building directly to the west of the appeal site is an 11-storey aparthotel currently under construction. I consider that the prevailing building heights at this inner-city location are generally between 2-5 storeys.
- 7.3.3. The proposed development is located in an area identified in the DCDP as a Strategic Development Regeneration Area, which are areas focused on compact growth facilitating intensification, infill and compaction. Development proposals for heights greater than the prevailing context will be considered on their merits and in accordance with the criteria set out in Appendix 3 of the DCDP.
- 7.3.4. The concept drawings submitted with the planning application, detail the proposed development within the context of the existing urban form. The proposed development is proposed as a 7-level development, with setbacks at the penthouse level presenting a 6-level apartment building to the Lane. I am satisfied that the applicants have demonstrated that the proposed building height aligns with the prevailing building heights at this location and with the default position of the DCDP of 6 storey development to Britian Place, and therefore the criteria set out in Appendix 3 of the DCDP is not applicable in this instance.
- 7.3.5. I conclude that the building height of the proposed development is appropriate at this inner-city centre location and complies with the provisions of Policy SC10 of the DCDP and *"The Urban Development and Building Heights Guidelines (2018)."*

#### **7.4. Density**

- 7.4.1. The proposed development relates to the construction of 16 apartments on an infill site with a stated area of 270m<sup>2</sup>. I calculate that this equates to a density provision of 592 units per hectare. The density guidance of the DCDP for City Centre and SDRA locations range between 100-250 units per hectare. The DCDP states that there will be a general presumption against schemes in excess of 300 units per hectare. The DCDP also states that schemes in excess of this density will only be considered in exceptional circumstances where a compelling architectural and urban design rationale has been provided.

- 7.4.2. In January 2024, the Department of Housing, Local Government and Heritage issued the “Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities”, which constitute Ministerial Guidelines under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended). The guidelines provide clarity in relation to the ranges of density provision to be applied within all settlement types.
- 7.4.3. Section 3.3.1 of the guidelines provides density ranges for Dublin City Centre of between 100dph and 300dph, Section 3.3.6 a) states that there is a presumption against higher densities on a piecemeal basis and that densities in excess of 300 dph (net) are open for consideration on a plan-led basis only and where the opportunity for densities and building heights that are greater than prevailing densities and building heights are identified in a relevant statutory plan.
- 7.4.4. I note that the exception outlined in Section 3.3.6 a) of the guidelines states that there is a presumption against higher densities on a piecemeal bases. I consider that the application submitted is piecemeal and not inclusive of any overall masterplan for the regeneration of this area. The guidelines state that densities in excess of 300dph (net) are open for consideration on a plan led basis only. I do not consider that the proposed development of this infill site was plan led in that it has only considered factors within this 270m<sup>2</sup> infill site and not the wider context of this inner-city location.
- 7.4.5. I note that the DCDP states that schemes in excess of a density of 300 dph will only be considered in exceptional circumstances where a compelling architectural and urban design rationale has been provided. The applicants have not provided any rational to consider a density of 592 units per hectare at this urban infill site location.
- 7.4.6. I consider that based on the above analysis and the information submitted with the application that no exceptional circumstances have been provided to consider a density of 592 units per hectare at this inner-city location. I am of the opinion a non-plan led approach has resulted in a development density of 592 units per hectare which does not comply with the provisions of Policy SC10 of the DCDP which provides for appropriate densities in the creation of sustainable communities in accordance with guidelines or with the provisions of section 15.5.5 of the DCDP which states that new development should achieve a density that is appropriate to the site conditions and location.

7.4.7. Table 3 of Appendix 3 sets out key criteria to justify densities higher than the prevailing development. It includes factors such as adequate infrastructural capacity, appropriate design response, appropriate housing mix and proximity to high quality public transport, employment and community services. Please see an assessment set out below of the proposed development against the 10 no. objectives of Table 3:

Objective	Performance Criteria in Assessing Proposals for Enhanced Height, Density and Scale
To promote development with a sense of place and character.	The proposed development would not integrate well with the streetscape as the proposed changes to address the issues raised regarding overlooking and privacy would result in a monolith building design not respecting the existing character of the area.
To provide appropriate legibility.	The increased density of the proposal does not respond to the context of the surrounding area and would not contribute positively to the streetscape due to inappropriate design considerations.
To provide appropriate continuity and enclosure of streets and spaces.	The proposed development would provide some element of passive surveillance at street level.
To provide well connected, high quality and active public and communal spaces.	An appropriate level of secure and accessible cycle parking is proposed within the site which is also situated close to high quality public transport corridors.  There is an inadequate provision of communal open space. (21m <sup>2</sup> provided)
To provide high quality, attractive and useable private spaces.	Private outdoor space is provided, however the design characteristics such as balconies, and window placements result in overlooking of adjacent property.
To promote mix of use and diversity of activities.	The proposed development would be a mono use for residential purposes only. No other uses proposed.

To ensure high quality and environmentally sustainable buildings	<p>Flooding has been appropriately considered within the application.</p> <p>A green roof is proposed as part of the surface water management system, however as the proposed development occupies the entire footprint of the site, no other sustainable surface water measures are proposed.</p> <p>A building life cycle report has been submitted.</p>
To secure sustainable density, intensity at locations of high accessibility.	The site is situated close to a high-quality public transport corridor and has eliminated all car parking proposals on the site. Adequate cycle parking is proposed.
To protect historic environments from insensitive development.	The design and layout of the proposed development has failed to adequately address the setting and character of the area..
To ensure appropriate management and maintenance.	A management plan is not received with the application.

7.4.8. I do not consider that the proposed development complies with the performance criteria listed above from Table 3 of Appendix 3 of the DCDP, and therefore the proposed density of 592 units per hectare on a site with an area of 270m<sup>2</sup> is overdevelopment of this small infill site and is contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 7.5. Plot Ratio and Site Coverage

7.5.1. The site has a stated area of 270m<sup>2</sup>. Indicative site coverage and plot ratio standards are set out in Appendix 3 of the DCDP. The calculated plot ratio of the proposed development is 5.9 with a site coverage of 97%. Both exceed the indicative plot ratio of 2.5-3.0 and site coverage of 60-90% of the DCDP, however Section 3 of Appendix 3 of the DCDP facilitates higher plot ratios and site coverage in certain

circumstances, where a development adjoins major public transport corridors and to facilitate comprehensive re-development in areas in need of urban renewal.

- 7.5.2. I consider that the exceedances in plot ratio and site coverage is justified in this instance due to the central location of the application site, it comprises an infill site in an area in need of urban renewal and is in close proximity to high quality public transport, such as Luas and Bus services, and accessibility

## **7.6. Design Standards for New Apartments**

- 7.6.1. Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023) set out national policy and standards for apartment development including recommended standards in relation to housing mix, aspect, and minimum floor areas.
- 7.6.2. Following a request for further information from the Planning Authority, the applicant reduced the number of apartments from 17 to 16 providing for 3 Studio type units, 3 one-bed units, 6 two bed units and 4 three bed units.
- 7.6.3. The DCDP plan requires schemes of 15 units or more to provide a unit mix of 15% three or more-bedroom units and a maximum of 25% - 30% one bedroom / studio units. The mix proposed by the applicant is 37.5 % Studio or one- bed units, 37.5% two bed units and 25% three-bed units.
- 7.6.4. SPPR1 the states that developments may include up 50% one-bedroom or studio type units, with no more than 20%-25% of the total proposed development as studios but also states that statutory development plans may specify a mix subject to an evidence-based Housing Need and Demand Assessment (HNDA). The DCDP evidence based HNDA housing mix is outlined in Section 7.6.3 above
- 7.6.5. SPPR 2 states that on urban infill sites of up to 0.25Ha where up to 9 units are proposed, notwithstanding SPPR1 there shall be no restriction on dwelling mix provided no more than 50% of the development comprises studio type units. However, in developments where 10 to 49 residential units are proposed the flexibility for 9 units may be carried forward and the parameters set out in SPPR1 shall apply from the 10<sup>th</sup> unit upwards..
- 7.6.6. I am of the opinion that the guidelines take precedence in this case, as the HNDA of the DCDP was prepared prior to the publication of the guidelines. I am satisfied



based on the Criteria of SPPR2 and SPPR1 that the proposed mix complies with the provisions of the 2023 apartment guidelines and with the provisions of Policy SC12 of the DCDP by providing a variety of apartment types and sizes.

- 7.6.7. SSPR4 requires a minimum of 33% of the total number apartments to be dual aspect units. I am satisfied that currently 11 of the 16 apartments proposed are dual aspect, however as there is overlooking issues relating to five of the apartments, which will be assessed in Section 7.7 below, dual aspect apartments could potentially be reduced to 6 no. apartments in total.. Therefore, 6 apartments out of the 16 apartments would remain dual aspect which is 37.5% of the total proposed development. I conclude that, notwithstanding the reduction of dual aspect apartments, the proposed development complies with SPPR4 of the guidelines as it exceeds the minimum 33% requirement for dual aspect apartments.
- 7.6.8. Having examined the floor plans submitted with the planning application, I am satisfied that all studio apartments exceed the minimum floor area of 37m<sup>2</sup>, all 1 bed units exceed the minimum floor area of 45m<sup>2</sup>, all 2 bed units exceed the minimum floor area of 63m<sup>2</sup> and all 3 bed units exceed the minimum floor area of 90m<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, I am satisfied the proposed development complies with the minimum apartment floor areas specified in SPPR3 of the guidelines.
- 7.6.9. Internal storage space is provided for each apartment, I am satisfied that the internal storage space provided for the 3 no. studio apartments, 3 no. one bed apartments and 6 no. two bed apartments comply with the provisions of the guidelines. However, I have calculated, from the drawings provided, that the storage provision of the 4 no three bed units at 6m<sup>2</sup> which is less than the minimum 9m<sup>2</sup> required by the guidelines.
- 7.6.10. I note that section 3.34 of the guidelines provides for a relaxation of internal storage space, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality on urban infill sites of up to 0.25ha. However, I am of the opinion that the density issues assessed in section 7.4 above have influenced the overall design concept of the proposed development, and that a scheme designed to a more appropriate density at this location could address the shortfall in the provision of internal storage space. Therefore, I conclude that the development proposed does not comply with the internal storage space provisions of the guidelines.

- 7.6.11. Private amenity space is provided for each apartment, I am satisfied that the private amenity space for the apartments complies with the minimum requirements of 4m<sup>2</sup> for studio apartments, 5m<sup>2</sup> for one bed apartments, 6m<sup>2</sup> for 2 bed apartments, and the 9m<sup>2</sup> for three bed apartments. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed development complies with the minimum private amenity standards of the guidelines.
- 7.6.12. The guidelines suggest that communal amenity space may be provided as a garden within a courtyard of a permitter block, roof gardens may also be considered. I note that the provision of communal facilities is a separate optional provision detailed in the guidelines and in my opinion is separate to communal open space provisions.
- 7.6.13. The communal open space provision required by the proposed development of 16 apartments is calculated at 99m<sup>2</sup>. (4m<sup>2</sup> per studio equates to 12m<sup>2</sup>; 5m<sup>2</sup> per one bed equates to 15m<sup>2</sup>; 6m<sup>2</sup> per two bed equates to 36m<sup>2</sup>; 9m<sup>2</sup> per three bed equates to 26m<sup>2</sup>). Communal open space provision is provided on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor by a terrace. The applicant's proposal includes at ground floor level residents foyer and two workspace / meeting rooms with floor areas of 46.44m<sup>2</sup> and 17.8m<sup>2</sup> and suggests that such areas could be considered as part of the communal open space provision. I note that section 4.5 of the guidelines communal amenity space make a distinction between Section 4.10 of the guidelines communal facilities, and therefore I am of the opinion that communal facilities should not be used in calculating communal open space provision.
- 7.6.14. I note that section 4.12 of the guidelines provides for a relaxation of communal open space, on a case-by-case basis, subject to overall design quality on urban infill sites of up to 0.25ha. The applicant has suggested in the response to the further information to the Planning Authority, that the removal of the apartment on the 7<sup>th</sup> level replaced by a roof garden could be conditioned to provide adequate open space provision. Roof gardens are considered in section 4.11 of the guidelines provided it is accessible to residents, subject to requirements such as safe access by children.
- 7.6.15. However, I am of the opinion that the density issues assessed in section 7.4 above has influenced the overall design concept of the proposed development, and that a scheme designed to a more appropriate density at this location could address the shortfall in the provision of community amenity space. Therefore, I conclude that the

development proposed does not comply with the communal amenity space provisions of the guidelines.

7.6.16. Bicycle storage provisions in accordance with the guidelines is calculated at 18 spaces for residents and 8 visitor spaces. The applicant has provided 18 bicycle spaces for residents and 8 bicycle spaces for visitors and has also provided storage for 'Cargo Type' bicycles as requires by the PA. I am satisfied that bicycle storage complies with the requirements of DCDP and the guidelines.

7.6.17. In relation to car-parking provision, section 4.21 of the guidelines states that apartment proposals in central locations that are served by public transport, the default policy is for car parking provision to be minimised, substantially reduced or wholly eliminated. I consider that the provision of car parking can be eliminated as the site is considered an infill site and is in close proximity to high quality public transport and therefore compliant with the guidelines.

## **7.7. Daylight and Overshadowing**

7.7.1. I note the daylight and overshadowing assessment submitted with the planning application. I note that 100% of all rooms analysed meet the target Lux levels for bedrooms and kitchen, living, dining room areas. All window receptors meet the target levels set out in standards and are considered to provide an acceptable standard of amenity from a daylight perspective.

7.7.2. I note the only residential property adjoining the development is to the south of the site. In relation to overshadowing, given the built-up nature of the location and surrounding buildings ranging in height from 4 to 11 storeys, some level of overshadowing would be expected at this city centre location. However, I consider the levels do not significantly impact on these residential properties.

7.7.3. A Vertical Sky Component (VSC) analysis was carried out to determine the potential impact of the proposed development on daylight amenity of the residential properties to the south of the site. A VSC assesses the amount of daylight that can enter a building through its windows. A minimum SVC of 27% is required for good daylight or failing that, it does not reduce daylight levels by more than 20% of the current value when the proposed development is completed. Of the 39 windows analysed, 21 are predicted to surpass daylight levels. I note that there is separation distance of 7m proposed between both buildings. A VSC was also carried out for the proposed

development three more times, in each case removing a floor. This analysis also indicated daylight level failures, which suggests that any development of the site in question that delivers a sustainable residential density will have a daylight impact on the adjacent residential properties. However, the guidelines allow some flexibility in urban settings where higher buildings are common. Therefore, I considered that the predicted reduction in daylight to the existing residential properties to the south of the site is acceptable given the city centre location and existing surrounding building heights.

## **7.8. Potential Impact on Development Potential of adjoining Lands**

- 7.8.1. I note that as part of the further information request by the PA, that the applicant was requested to address 3<sup>rd</sup> party issues relating to overlooking from the proposed north facing windows and terraces resulting in potential constraints in the development of lands adjoining the site to the north.
- 7.8.2. Regarding the roof top terrace, the applicant proposes to provide a solid wall along the northern façade preventing overlooking of the adjoining lands. I am satisfied that providing the wall will resolve the overlooking issues of the communal terrace on the 7<sup>th</sup> level of the proposed development.
- 7.8.3. I note that the applicant has not responded to the north facing terraces proposed for apartment 3 and the penthouse apartment. The details submitted indicate that both terraces are setback from the northern boundary. I am of the opinion that both terraces associated with apartment 3 and the penthouse, will overlook the adjoining property to the north and I am not satisfied that the setback will alleviate overlooking issues, potentially constraining the development options of the adjoining lands to the north.
- 7.8.4. I am of the opinion that the excessive density provision and site size has resulted in a design concept that requires both terraces to comply with the apartment guidelines relating to private open space provision and I consider that a redesign to an appropriate density would avoid the provision of terraces along the northern elevation, eliminating any overlooking issues, whilst complying with the provisions of the guidelines.
- 7.8.5. In relation to the lift lobby windows, the applicant notes that these windows are set back 2.5m from the northern boundary and also notes that windows to the lift lobby

area are not a statutory requirement and suggests that these windows can be replaced by solid masonry construction if required. However, the proposal is to provide these windows with an 'opal laminated' glazing, which is white in colour, allows daylight to enter, but completely blocks any ability to view out or overlook. I am satisfied that whilst the development of the adjoining site, may reduce daylight availability to the lift lobby area, I am of the opinion that the development potential of the adjoining site will not be constrained by the provision of 'opal laminated' glazing to the proposed lift lobby windows.

- 7.8.6. However, I note from the drawings submitted with the application, that apartments, 10, 12 and 15 have kitchen windows located facing east onto a blank façade to the side of the lift lobby windows. I am not satisfied, based on the VSC assessment submitted for the existing residential building to the south, that these kitchen windows located within 2m from the north boundary of the site, would not be impacted by reduced daylight amenity resulting from any development of 6 storeys or above on the adjoining site to the north. The applicant has provided no details to demonstrate that if the adjoining site was developed above the 6<sup>th</sup> storey that apartments 10, 11 and 15 would retain the minimum 100 lux. level requirement.
- 7.8.7. In relation to the kitchen window in apartments 3,6,8,12,14, and 16, the applicant notes that these apartments repeat on each level, and that the windows are set back 2.5 metres from the northern boundary of the site. The applicant notes that these are not the primary windows in this space and similar to the lift lobby windows, retains these windows, but provides an 'opal laminated' glass, which is white in colour, allows daylight to enter, but completely blocks any ability to view out or overlook. I note the applicant's response to the grounds of appeal suggests that if required these windows could be replaced with solid walls. I consider that these windows need to be omitted from the development design proposal as they would limit the potential to develop the adjoining lands to the North, and as such has the potential to reduce the daylight amenity of these apartments below the minimum lux. level required. I consider that there is a level of uncertainty as to the potential reduction in daylight amenity for these apartments if a development 6 storeys or above was considered on the adjoining site.
- 7.8.8. The applicant has stated that these kitchen windows are not the primary windows in this space, but has provided no clarity as to effect, if any, that the proposed glazing

or replacing these windows with solid wall will have on the daylight amenity to these apartments. On the basis of the information presented I am not satisfied that such changes would not result in the provision of substandard accommodation which has to potential to seriously injure the amenities of future residents occupying the proposed apartments..

- 7.8.9. I consider that the excessive density proposed has led to the design approach resulting in overlooking issues. I am of the opinion that a more plan led approach taking into consideration the development potential of adjoining lands, ensuring that the issues relating to the northern elevation were addressed, would result in an overall greater quantum of housing at this location taking all developable lands on adjoining sites into consideration. I am also of the opinion that a plan led approach, providing a sustainable density would provide an optimal design to maximise the potential of the appellant site, without impacting on the development potential of adjoining sites.

## **7.9. Other Matters**

- 7.9.1. Part V provision is not applicable in respect of development consisting of the provision of 4 or fewer houses or for housing on land of 0.1 hectares or less. As the appeal site is 0.027 hectares Part V provisions do not apply.
- 7.9.2. A Flood Risk analysis was submitted with the planning application, which indicated that the proposed development is situated outside Flood Zone A and B and that there would be no significant increase in the risk of flooding either within or downstream of the site.

## **8.0 AA Screening**

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed apartment development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The subject site is located in the city centre and considered an infill site 3.6km to the to the nearest European Site. The proposed development comprises a 7-level apartment building on an infill site of 270m<sup>2</sup>. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal site. Having considered the nature, scale and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because it could not have any effect on a European Site.

The reason for this conclusion is as follows [insert as relevant]:

- Apartment development location on city centre infill site of 270m2.
- The city centre location is 3.km from the nearest Natura 2000 site with no ecological connection from the site to the Natura 2000 site.

I conclude, on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 9.0 Recommendation

Having considered the contents of the application, the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, the provisions of the '*Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024*' and the '*Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New Apartments, Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2023*', the grounds of appeal and response to the appeal submitted, my site inspection and my assessment of the planning issues. I recommend that planning permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

1) The proposed development consists of 16 apartments on an 0.027-hectare site, which results in a residential density of 592 units per hectare. Having regard to:

- Policy SC10 and Section 15.5.5 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028, which states that densities in excess of 300 unit per hectare will only be considered in exceptional circumstances where a compelling architectural and urban design rational has been provided
- the Ministerial Guidelines title the '*Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024*' issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, (as

amended), which considers that a density of between 100-250 units per hectare is an appropriate density for Dublin City Centre, and densities in excess 300 units per hectare are open for consideration on a plan-led basis.

In the absence of such exceptional circumstances or a rationale provided for densities in excess of 300 units per hectare. It is considered that the proposed development would constitute overdevelopment of the subject site which would be contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2023-2029 and the '*Sustainable Residential Development and Compact Settlements: Guidelines for Planning Authorities 2024*' issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, (as amended), therefore the proposal would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

- 2) Having regard to the size and layout of the apartments, the inadequacy of the communal open space, internal storage space, and the proposed design amendments to the scheme to address overlooking issues of adjoining lands. It is considered the proposed development would represent an inappropriate development proposal contrary to the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan 2022-2028 and contrary to the Ministerial Guidelines title the "*Sustainable Urban Housing: Design Standards for New apartment Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2023)*", issued under Section 28 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, (as amended). It is considered that the proposed development would result in substandard residential accommodation which would seriously injure the amenities of future residents and would depreciate the value of property in the vicinity by potentially constraining the development potential of neighbouring property. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.



I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Alan Di Lucia  
Senior Planning Inspector

July 2025

### Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-322235-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	17 apartments and associated and ancillary development works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Britain Place, Dublin 1, to the rear of Cumberland Street North and Parnell Street, Dublin 1
	<b>In all cases check box /or leave blank</b>
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b>  (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes,  - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1.</del>  <b>EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.</b>	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
<b>3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road</del>	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p><b>No Screening required.</b></p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p><b>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</b></p>	<p><b>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</b></p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p><b>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</b></p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</b></p>	<p>Class 10 (b) (i), threshold &gt;500 dwellings.</p>

<p><b>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</b></p>	
<p><b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Screening Determination required (Complete Form 3)</b></p>
<p><b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><b>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</b></p>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

<b>Case Reference</b>	ABP-322235-25
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	17 apartments and associated and ancillary development works.
<b>Development Address</b>	Britain Place, Dublin 1, to the rear of Cumberland Street North and Parnell Street, Dublin 1
<b>This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.</b>	
<b>Characteristics of proposed development</b>  (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	<p>The proposed development is located in a city centre location characterised by a mix of development uses from residential, commercial and social. It is for 16 residential units location on an infill site.</p> <p>The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ significantly from that arising from other urban developments.</p>
<b>Location of development</b>  (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	<p>The development would be located in a serviced urban area and would not have the potential to significantly impact on an ecologically sensitive site or location. There is no hydrological connection present such as would give rise to significant impact on nearby water courses (whether linked to any European site or other sensitive receptors). The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances that differ significantly from that arising from other urban developments.</p>
<b>Types and characteristics of potential impacts</b>  (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration,	<p>Given the nature of the development and the site/surroundings, it would not have the potential to significantly affect other significant environmental sensitivities in the area.</p>

cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	
Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
<del>There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.</del>	<del>Schedule 7A Information required to enable a Screening Determination to be carried out.</del>
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIAR required.

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

DP/ADP: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)